arXiv:quant-ph/9904066v1 16 Apr 1999

Probabilities to accept languages by quantum finite automata

Andris Ambainis*
Computer Science Division
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-2320
e-mail:ambainis@cs.berkeley.edu

Richard Bonner
Department of Mathematics and Physics
Mälardalens University, Sweden
e-mail:richard.bonner@mdh.se

Rūsiņš Freivalds†
Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Latvia
Raiņa bulv. 29, Riga, Latvia
e-mail:rusins@cclu.lv

Arnolds Ķikusts‡
Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Latvia
Raiņa bulv. 29, Riga, Latvia
e-mail:sd70053@lanet.lv

Abstract

We construct a hierarchy of regular languages such that the current language in the hierarchy can be accepted by 1-way quantum finite automata with a probability smaller than the corresponding probability for the preceding language in the hierarchy. These probabilities converge to $\frac{1}{2}$.

*Supported by Berkeley Fellowship for Graduate Studies.
†Research supported by Grant No.96.0282 from the Latvian Council of Science
‡Research supported by Grant No.96.0282 from the Latvian Council of Science

1 Introduction

Quantum computation is a most challenging project involving research both by physicists and computer scientists. The principles of quantum computation differ from the principles of classical computation very much. The classical computation is based on classical mechanics while quantum computation attempts to exploit phenomena specific to quantum physics.

One of features of quantum mechanics is that a quantum process can be in a combination (called *superposition*) of several states and these several states can interact one with another. A computer scientist would call this *a massive parallelism*. This possibility of massive parallelism is very important for Computer Science. In 1982, Nobel prize winner physicist Richard Feynman (1918-1988) asked what effects the principles of quantum mechanics can have on computation[Fe 82]. An exact simulation of quantum processes demands exponential running time. Therefore, there may be other computations which are performed nowadays by classical computers but might be simulated by quantum processes in much less time.

R.Feynman's influence was (and is) so high that rather soon this possibility was explored both theoretically and practically. David Deutsch[De 89] introduced quantum Turing machines, quantum physical counterparts of probabilistic Turing machines. He conjectured that they may be more efficient that classical Turing machines. He also showed the existence of a universal quantum Turing machine. This construction was subsequently improved by Bernstein and Vazirani [BV 97] and Yao [Ya 93].

Quantum Turing machines might have remained relatively unknown but two events caused a drastical change. First, Peter Shor [Sh 97] invented surprising polynomial-time quantum algorithms for computation of discrete logarithms and for factorization of integers. Second, unusual quantum circuits having no classical counterparts (such as quantum bit teleportation) have been physically implemented. Hence, there is a chance that universal quantum computers may be built. Moreover, since the modern public-key cryptography is based on intractability of discrete logarithms and factorization of integers, building a quantum computer implies building a code-breaking machine.

In this paper, we consider quantum finite automata (QFAs), a different model of quantum computation. This is a simpler model than quantum Turing machines and and it may be simpler to implement.

Quantum finite automata have been studied in [AF 98, BP 99, KW 97, MC 97]. Surprisingly, QFAs do not generalize deterministic finite automata.

Their capabilities are incomparable. QFAs can be exponentially more space-efficient[AF 98]. However, there are regular languages that cannot be recognized by quantum finite automata[KW 97].

This weakness is caused by reversibility. Any quantum computation is performed by means of unitary operators. One of the simplest properties of these operators shows that such a computation is reversible. The result always determines the input uniquely. It may seem to be a very strong limitation. Luckily, for unrestricted quantum algorithms (for instance, for quantum Turing machines) this is not so. It is possible to embed any irreversible computation in an appropriate environment which makes it reversible[Be 89]. For instance, the computing agent could keep the inputs of previous calculations in successive order. Quantum finite automata are more sensitive to the reversibility requirement.

If the probability with which a QFA is required to be correct decreases, the set of languages that can be recognized increases. In particular[AF 98], there are languages that can be recognized with probability 0.68 but not with probability 7/9. In this paper, we extend this result by constructing a hierarchy of languages in which each next language can be recognized with a smaller probability than the previous one.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basics of quantum computation

To explain the difference between classical and quantum mechanical world, we first consider one-bit systems. A classical bit is in one of two classical states $true$ and $false$. A *probabilistic* counterpart of the classical bit can be $true$ with a probability α and $false$ with probability β, where $\alpha + \beta = 1$. A *quantum bit (qubit)* is very much like to it with the following distinction. For a *qubit* α and β can be arbitrary complex numbers with the property $\|\alpha\|^2 + \|\beta\|^2 = 1$. If we observe a qubit, we get $true$ with probability $\|\alpha\|^2$ and $false$ with probability $\|\beta\|^2$, just like in probabilistic case. However, if we modify a quantum system without observing it (we will explain what this means), the set of transformations that one can perform is larger than in the probabilistic case. This is where the power of quantum computation comes from.

More generally, we consider quantum systems with m basis states. We denote the basis states $|q_1\rangle$, $|q_2\rangle$, ..., $|q_m\rangle$. Let ψ be a linear combination of

them with complex coefficients

$$\psi = \alpha_1 |q_1\rangle + \alpha_2 |q_2\rangle + \ldots + \alpha_m |q_m\rangle .$$

The l_2 norm of ψ is

$$\|\psi\| = \sqrt{|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 + \ldots + |\alpha_m|^2}.$$

The state of a quantum system can be any ψ with $\|\psi\| = 1$. ψ is called a *superposition* of $|q_1\rangle$, ..., $|q_m\rangle$. α_1, ..., α_m are called *amplitudes* of $|q_1\rangle$, ..., $|q_m\rangle$. We use $l_2(Q)$ to denote the vector space consisting of all linear combinations of $|q_1\rangle$, ..., $|q_m\rangle$.

Allowing arbitrary complex amplitudes is essential for physics. However, it is not important for quantum computation. Anything that can be computed with complex amplitudes can be done with only real amplitudes as well. This was shown for quantum Turing machines in [BV 93][1] and the same proof works for QFAs. However, it is important that *negative* amplitudes are allowed. For this reason, we assume that all amplitudes are (possibly negative) reals.

There are two types of transformations that can be performed on a quantum system. The first type are unitary transformations. A unitary transformation is a linear transformation U on $l_2(Q)$ that preserves l_2 norm. (This means that any ψ with $\|\psi\| = 1$ is mapped to ψ' with $\|\psi'\| = 1$.)

Second, there are measurements. The simplest measurement is observing $\psi = \alpha_1 |q_1\rangle + \alpha_2 |q_2\rangle + \ldots + \alpha_m |q_m\rangle$ in the basis $|q_1\rangle, \ldots, |q_m\rangle$. It gives $|q_i\rangle$ with probability α_i^2. ($\|\psi\| = 1$ guarantees that probabilities of different outcomes sum to 1.) After the measurement, the state of the system changes to $|q_i\rangle$ and repeating the measurement gives the same state $|q_i\rangle$.

In this paper, we also use *partial measurements*. Let $Q_1, \ldots, Q_k$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of Q such that $Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup \ldots \cup Q_k = Q$. Let E_j, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, denote the subspace of $l_2(Q)$ spanned by $|q_j\rangle$, $j \in Q_i$. Then, a *partial measurement* w.r.t. $E_1, \ldots, E_k$ gives the answer $\psi \in E_j$ with probability $\sum_{i \in Q_j} \alpha_i^2$. After that, the state of the system collapses to the projection of ψ to E_j. This projection is $\psi_j = \sum_{i \in Q_j} \alpha_i |q_i\rangle$.

2.2 Quantum finite automata

Quantum finite automata were introduced twice. First this was done by C. Moore and J.P.Crutchfield [MC 97]. Later in a different and non-equivalent way these automata were introduced by A. Kondacs and J. Watrous [KW 97].

[1] For unknown reason, this proof does not appear in [BV 97].

The first definition just mimics the definition of 1-way probabilistic finite automata only substituting *stochastic* matrices by *unitary* ones. We use a more elaborated definition [KW 97].

A QFA is a tuple $M = (Q; \Sigma; V; q_0; Q_{acc}; Q_{rej})$ where Q is a finite set of states, Σ is an input alphabet, V is a transition function, $q_0 \in Q$ is a starting state, and $Q_{acc} \subset Q$ and $Q_{rej} \subset Q$ are sets of accepting and rejecting states. The states in Q_{acc} and Q_{rej} are called *halting states* and the states in $Q_{non} = Q - (Q_{acc} \cup Q_{rej})$ are called *non halting states*. κ and \$ are symbols that do not belong to Σ. We use κ and \$ as the left and the right endmarker, respectively. The *working alphabet* of M is $\Gamma = \Sigma \cup \{\kappa; \$\}$.

The transition function V is a mapping from $\Gamma \times l_2(Q)$ to $l_2(Q)$ such that, for every $a \in \Gamma$, the function $V_a : l_2(Q) \to l_2(Q)$ defined by $V_a(x) = V(a, x)$ is a unitary transformation.

The computation of a QFA starts in the superposition $|q_0\rangle$. Then transformations corresponding to the left endmarker κ, the letters of the input word x and the right endmarker \$ are applied. The transformation corresponding to $a \in \Gamma$ consists of two steps.

1. First, V_a is applied. The new superposition ψ' is $V_a(\psi)$ where ψ is the superposition before this step.

2. Then, ψ' is observed with respect to $E_{acc}, E_{rej}, E_{non}$ where $E_{acc} = span\{|q\rangle : q \in Q_{acc}\}$, $E_{rej} = span\{|q\rangle : q \in Q_{rej}\}$, $E_{non} = span\{|q\rangle : q \in Q_{non}\}$ (see section 2.1).

If we get $\psi' \in E_{acc}$, the input is accepted. If we get $\psi' \in E_{rej}$, the input is rejected. If we get $\psi' \in E_{non}$, the next transformation is applied.

We regard these two transformations as reading a letter a. We use V'_a to denote the transformation consisting of V_a followed by projection to E_{non}. This is the transformation mapping ψ to the non-halting part of $V_a(\psi)$. We use ψ_y to denote the non-halting part of QFA's state after reading the left endmarker κ and the word $y \in \Sigma^*$.

We compare QFAs with different probabilities of correct answer. This problem was first considered by A. Ambainis and R. Freivalds[AF 98]. The following theorems were proved there:

Theorem 2.1 *Let L be a language and M be its minimal automaton. Assume that there is a word x such that M contains states q_1, q_2 satisfying:*

1. *$q_1 \neq q_2$,*

2. *If M starts in the state q_1 and reads x, it passes to q_2,*

3. If M starts in the state q_2 and reads x, it passes to q_2, and

4. q_2 is neither "all-accepting" state, nor "all-rejecting" state.

Then L cannot be recognized by a 1-way quantum finite automaton with probability $7/9 + \epsilon$ for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$.

Theorem 2.2 *Let L be a language and M be its minimal automaton. If there is no q_1, q_2, x satisfying conditions of Theorem 2.1 then L can be recognized by a 1-way reversible finite automaton (i.e. L can be recognized by a 1-way quantum finite automaton with probability 1).*

Theorem 2.3 *The language a^*b^* can be recognized by a 1-way QFA with the probability of correct answer $p = 0.68...$ where p is the root of $p^3 + p = 1$.*

Corollary 2.1 *There is a language that can be recognized by a 1-QFA with probability $0.68...$ but not with probability $7/9 + \epsilon$.*

For probabilistic automata, the probability of correct answer can be increased arbitrarily and this property of probabilistic computation is considered as evident. Theorems above show thatits counterpart is not true in the quantum world! The reason for that is that the model of QFAs mixes reversible (quantum computation) components with nonreversible (measurements after every step).

In this paper, we consider the best probabilities of acceptance by 1-way quantum finite automata the languages $a^*b^* \dots z^*$. Since the reason why the language a^*b^* cannot be accepted by 1-way quantum finite automata is the property described in the Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, this new result provides an insight on what the hierarchy of languages with respect to the probabilities of their acceptance by 1-way quantum finite automata may be. We also show a generalization of Theorem 2.3 in a style similar to Theorem 2.2.

3 Main results

Lemma 3.1 *For arbitrary real $x_1 > 0$, $x_2 > 0$, ..., $x_n > 0$, there exists a unitary $n \times n$ matrix $M_n(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ with elements m_{ij} such that*

$$m_{11} = \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + ... + x_n^2}},\ m_{21} = \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + ... + x_n^2}},\ ..., m_{n1} = \frac{x_n}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + ... + x_n^2}}.$$

□

Let L_n be the language $a_1^*a_2^*...a_n^*$.

Theorem 3.1 *The language L_n ($n > 1$) can be recognized by a 1-way QFA with the probability of correct answer p where p is the root of $p^{\frac{n+1}{n-1}} + p = 1$ in the interval $[1/2, 1]$.*

Proof: Let m_{ij} be the elements of the matrix $M_k(x_1, x_2, ..., x_k)$ from Lemma 3.1. We construct a $k \times (k-1)$ matrix $T_k(x_1, x_2, ..., x_k)$ with elements $t_{ij} = m_{i,j+1}$. Let $R_k(x_1, x_2, ..., x_k)$ be a $k \times k$ matrix with elements $r_{ij} = \frac{x_i \cdot x_j}{x_1^2 + ... + x_k^2}$ and I_k be the $k \times k$ identity matrix.

For fixed n, let $p_n \in [1/2, 1]$ satisfy $p_n^{\frac{n+1}{n-1}} + p_n = 1$ and p_k $(1 \le k < n) = p_n^{\frac{k-1}{n-1}} - p_n^{\frac{k}{n-1}}$. It is easy to see that $p_1 + p_2 + ... + p_n = 1$ and

$$1 - \frac{p_n(p_k + ... + p_n)^2}{(p_{k-1} + ... + p_n)^2} = 1 - \frac{p_n p_n^{\frac{2(k-1)}{n-1}}}{p_n^{\frac{2(k-2)}{n-1}}} = 1 - p_n^{\frac{n+1}{n-1}} = p_n. \qquad (1)$$

Now we describe a 1-way QFA accepting the language L_n.

The automaton has $2n$ states: q_1, q_2, ... q_n are non halting states, q_{n+1}, q_{n+2}, ... q_{2n-1} are rejecting states and q_{2n} is an accepting state. The transition function is defined by unitary block matrices

$$V_\kappa = \begin{pmatrix} M_n(\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I_n \end{pmatrix},$$

$$V_{a_1} = \begin{pmatrix} R_n(\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & T_n(\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} \\ T_n^T(\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$V_{a_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{0} & 1 & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & R_{n-1}(\sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} & T_{n-1}(\sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} \\ 1 & \mathbf{0} & 0 & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & T_{n-1}^T(\sqrt{p_2}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & 0 & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

...,

$$V_{a_k} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & I_{k-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & R_{n+1-k}(\sqrt{p_k}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} & T_{n+1-k}(\sqrt{p_k}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} \\ I_{k-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & T_{n+1-k}^T(\sqrt{p_k}, ..., \sqrt{p_n}) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\ldots,$$

$$V_{a_n} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & I_{n-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & 1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ I_{n-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$V_{\$} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & I_n \\ I_n & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Case 1. The input is $\kappa a_1^* a_2^* ... a_n^* \$$.

The starting superposition is $|q_1\rangle$. After reading the left endmarker the superposition becomes $\sqrt{p_1}\,|q_1\rangle + \sqrt{p_2}\,|q_2\rangle + \ldots + \sqrt{p_n}\,|q_n\rangle$ and after reading a_1^* the superposition remains the same.

If the input contains a_k then reading the first a_k changes the non-halting part of the superposition to $\sqrt{p_k}\,|q_k\rangle + \ldots + \sqrt{p_n}\,|q_n\rangle$ and after reading all the rest of a_k the non-halting part of the superposition remains the same.

Reading the right endmarker maps $|q_n\rangle$ to $|q_{2n}\rangle$. Therefore, the superposition after reading it contains $\sqrt{p_n}\,|q_{2n}\rangle$. This means that the automaton accepts with probability p_n because q_{2n} is an accepting state.

Case 2. The input is $\kappa a_1^* a_2^* ... a_k^* a_k a_m ...$ $(k > m)$.

After reading the last a_k the non-halting part of the superposition is $\sqrt{p_k}\,|q_k\rangle$
$+ \ldots + \sqrt{p_n}\,|q_n\rangle$. Then reading a_m changes the non-halting part to $\frac{\sqrt{p_m}(p_k+...+p_n)}{(p_m+...+p_n)}\,|q_m\rangle + \ldots + \frac{\sqrt{p_n}(p_k+...+p_n)}{(p_m+...+p_n)}\,|q_n\rangle$. This means that the automaton accepts with probability $\leq \frac{p_n(p_k+...+p_n)^2}{(p_m+...+p_n)^2}$ and rejects with probability at least

$$1 - \frac{p_n(p_k + ... + p_n)^2}{(p_m + ... + p_n)^2} \geq 1 - \frac{p_n(p_k + ... + p_n)^2}{(p_{k-1} + ... + p_n)^2} = p_n$$

that follows from (1). □

Corollary 3.1 *The language L_n can be recognized by a 1-way QFA with the probability of correct answer at least $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{n}$, for a constant c.*

Proof: By resolving the equation $p^{\frac{n+1}{n-1}} + p = 1$, we get $p = \frac{1}{2} + \Theta(\frac{1}{n})$. □

Theorem 3.2 *The language L_n cannot be recognized by a 1-way QFA with probability greater than p where p is the root of*

$$(2p-1) = \frac{2(1-p)}{n-1} + 4\sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}} \tag{2}$$

in the interval $[1/2, 1]$.

Proof: Assume we are given a 1-way QFA M. We show that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a word such that the probability of correct answer is less than $p+\epsilon$.

Lemma 3.2 *[AF 98] Let $x \in \Sigma^+$. There are subspaces E_1, E_2 such that $E_{non} = E_1 \oplus E_2$ and*

(i) If $\psi \in E_1$, then $V_x(\psi) \in E_1$,

(ii) If $\psi \in E_2$, then $\|V'_{x^k}(\psi)\| \to 0$ when $k \to \infty$.

We use $n-1$ such decompositions: for $x = a_2$, $x = a_3$, ..., $x = a_n$. The subspaces E_1, E_2 corresponding to $x = a_m$ are denoted $E_{m,1}$ and $E_{m,2}$.

Let $m \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, $y \in a_1^* a_2^* \ldots a_{m-1}^*$. Remember that ψ_y denotes the superposition after reading y (with observations w.r.t. $E_{non} \oplus E_{acc} \oplus E_{rej}$ after every step). We express ψ_y as $\psi_y^1 + \psi_y^2$, $\psi_y^1 \in E_{m,1}$, $\psi_y^2 \in E_{m,2}$.

Case 1. $\|\psi_y^2\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}}$ for some $m \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$ and $y \in a_1^* \ldots a_{m-1}^*$.

Let $i > 0$. Then, $ya_{m-1} \in L_n$ but $ya_m^i a_{m-1} \notin L_n$. Consider the distributions of probabilities on M's answers "accept" and "reject" on ya_{m-1} and $ya_m^i a_{m-1}$. If M recognizes L_n with probability $p+\epsilon$, it must accept ya_{m-1} with probability at least $p+\epsilon$ and reject it with probability at most $1-p-\epsilon$. Also, $ya_m^i a_{m-1}$ must be rejected with probability at least $p+\epsilon$ and accepted with probability at most $1-p-\epsilon$. Therefore, both the probabilities of accepting and the probabilities of rejecting must differ by at least

$$(p+\epsilon) - (1-p-\epsilon) = 2p - 1 + 2\epsilon.$$

This means that the *variational distance* between two probability distributions (the sum of these two distances) must be at least $2(2p-1) + 4\epsilon$. We show that it cannot be so large.

First, we select an appropriate i. Let k be so large that $\|V'_{a_m^k}(\psi_y^2)\| \leq \delta$ for $\delta = \epsilon/4$. $\psi_y^1, V'_{a_m}(\psi_y^1), V'_{a_m^2}(\psi_y^1), \ldots$ is a bounded sequence in a finite-dimensional space. Therefore, it has a limit point and there are i, j such that

$$\|V'_{a_m^j}(\psi_y^1) - V'_{a_m^{i+j}}(\psi_y^1)\| < \delta.$$

We choose i, j so that $i > k$.

The difference between the two probability distributions comes from two sources. The first source is the difference between ψ_y and $\psi_{ya_m^i}$ (the states of M before reading a_{m-1}). The second source is the possibility of M accepting while reading a_m^i (the only part that is different in the two words). We bound each of them.

The difference $\psi_y - \psi_{ya_m^i}$ can be partitioned into three parts.

$$\psi_y - \psi_{ya_m^i} = (\psi_y - \psi_y^1) + (\psi_y^1 - V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y^1)) + (V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y^1) - \psi_{ya_m^i}). \qquad (3)$$

The first part is $\psi_y - \psi_y^1 = \psi_y^2$ and $\|\psi_y^2\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}}$. The second and the third parts are both small. For the second part, notice that V'_{a_m} is unitary on $E_{m,1}$ (because V_{a_m} is unitary and $V_{a_m}(\psi)$ does not contain halting components for $\psi \in E_{m,1}$). Hence, V'_{a_m} preserves distances on $E_{m,1}$ and

$$\|\psi_y^1 - V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y^1)\| = \|V'_{a_m^j}(\psi_y^1) - V'_{a_m^{i+j}}(\psi_y^1)\| < \delta$$

For the third part of (3), remember that $\psi_{ya_m^i} = V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y)$. Therefore,

$$\psi_{ya_m^i} - V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y^1) = V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y) - V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y^1) = V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y - \psi_y^1) = V'_{a_m^i}(\psi_y^2)$$

and $\|\psi^2_{ya_m^i}\| \leq \delta$ because $i > k$. Putting all three parts together, we get

$$\|\psi_y - \psi_{ya_m^i}\| \leq \|\psi_y - \psi_y^1\| + \|\psi_y^1 - \psi^1_{ya_m^i}\| + \|\psi^1_{ya_m^i} - \psi_{ya_m^i}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}} + 2\delta.$$

Lemma 3.3 *[BV 97] Let ψ and ϕ be such that $\|\psi\| \leq 1$, $\|\phi\| \leq 1$ and $\|\psi - \phi\| \leq \epsilon$. Then the total variational distance resulting from measurements of ϕ and ψ is at most 4ϵ.*

This means that the difference between any probability distributions generated by ψ_y and $\psi_{ya_m^i}$ is at most

$$4\sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}} + 8\delta.$$

In particular, this is true for the probability distributions obtained by applying $V_{a_{m-1}}$, $V_\$$ and the corresponding measurements to ψ_y and $\psi_{ya_m^i}$.

The probability of M halting while reading a_m^i is at most $\|\psi_\kappa^2\|^2 = \frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}$. Adding it increases the variational distance by at most $\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}$. Hence, the total variational distance is at most

$$\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1} + 4\sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}} + 8\delta = \frac{2(1-p)}{n-1} + 4\sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}} + 2\epsilon.$$

By definition of p, this is the same as $(2p-1) + 2\epsilon$. However, if M distinguishes y and ya_m^i correctly, the variational distance must be at least $(2p-1) + 4\epsilon$. Hence, M does not recognize one of these words correctly.

Case 2. $\|\psi_y^2\| > \sqrt{\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1}}$ for every $m \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$ and $y \in a_1^* \ldots a_{m-1}^*$.

We define a sequence of words $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m \in a_1^* \ldots a_n^*$. Let $y_1 = a_1$ and $y_k = y_{k-1} a_k^{i_k}$ for $k \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$ where i_k is such that

$$\|V'_{a_k^{i_k}}(\psi^2_{y_{k-1}})\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{n-1}}.$$

The existence of i_k is guaranteed by (ii) of Lemma 3.2.

We consider the probability that M halts on $y_n = a_1 a_2^{i_2} a_3^{i_3} \ldots a_n^{i_n}$ before seeing the right endmarker. Let $k \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$. The probability of M halting while reading the $a_k^{i_k}$ part of y_n is at least

$$\|\psi^2_{y_{k-1}}\|^2 - \|V'_{a_k^{i_k}}(\psi^2_{y_{k-1}})\|^2 > \frac{2(1-p)}{n-1} - \frac{\epsilon}{n-1}.$$

By summing over all $k \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, the probability that M halts on y_n is at least

$$(n-1)\left(\frac{2(1-p)}{n-1} - \frac{\epsilon}{n-1}\right) = 2(1-p) - \epsilon.$$

This is the sum of the probability of accepting and the probability of rejecting. Hence, one of these two probabilities must be at least $(1-p) - \epsilon/2$. Then, the probability of the opposite answer on any extension of y_n is at most $1 - (1 - p - \epsilon/2) = p + \epsilon/2$. However, y_n has both extensions that are in L_n and extensions that are not. Hence, one of them is not recognized with probability $p + \epsilon$. □

By solving the equation (2), we get

Corollary 3.2 *L_n cannot be recognized with probability greater than $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n-1}}$.*

Proof: The right-hand side of (2) is at most $\frac{1}{n-1} + 4\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ because $p \geq 1/2$ and, hence, $1 - p \leq 1/2$. This implies

$$2p - 1 \leq \frac{1}{n-1} + 4\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}},$$

$$p \leq \frac{1}{2} + 2\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}} + \frac{1}{2(n-1)} \leq \frac{1}{2} + 3\sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}}$$

and L_n cannot be recognized with probability greater than p by Theorem 3.2. □

Let $n_1 = 2$ and $n_k = \frac{9n_{k-1}^2}{c^2} + 1$ for $k > 1$ (where c is the constant from Theorem 3.1). Also, define $p_k = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{n_k}$. Then, Corollaries 3.1 and 3.2 imply

Theorem 3.3 *For every $k > 1$, L_{n_k} can be recognized with by a 1-way QFA with the probability of correct answer p_k but cannot be recognized with the probability of correct answer p_{k-1}.*

Proof: By Corollary 3.1, L_{n_k} can be recognized with probability $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{n_k} = p_k$.

On the other hand, by Corollary 3.2, L_{n_k} cannot be recognized with probability $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n_k - 1}}$. The definition of n_k implies $n_k - 1 = \frac{9n_{k-1}^2}{c^2}$, $\sqrt{n_k - 1} = \frac{3n_{k-1}}{c}$,

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n_k - 1}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{n_{k-1}} = p_{k-1}.$$

□

Thus, we have constructed a sequence of languages L_{n_1}, L_{n_2}, ... such that, for each L_{n_k}, the probability with which L_{n_k} can be recognized by a 1-way QFA is smaller than for $L_{n_{k-1}}$.

Our final theorem is a counterpart of Theorem 2.2. It generalizes Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 3.4 *Let L be a language and M be its minimal automaton. If there is no q_1, q_2, q_3, x, y such that*

1. *the states q_1, q_2, q_3 are pairwise different,*
2. *If M starts in the state q_1 and reads x, it passes to q_2,*
3. *If M starts in the state q_2 and reads x, it passes to q_2, and*

4. *If M starts in the state q_2 and reads y, it passes to q_3,*

5. *If M starts in the state q_3 and reads y, it passes to q_3,*

6. *both q_2 and q_3 are neither "all-accepting" state, nor "all-rejecting" state,*

then L can be recognized by a 1-way quantum finite automaton with probability $p = 0.68...$.

References

[AF 98] Andris Ambainis and Rūsiņš Freivalds. 1-way quantum finite automata: strengths, weaknesses and generalizations. *Proc. 39th FOCS,* 1998, p. 332– 341. Also quant-ph/9802062.

[Be 89] Charles Bennett. Time-space tradeoffs for reversible computation. *SIAM J. Computing*, 18:766-776, 1989.

[BP 99] A. Brodsky, N. Pippenger. Characterizations of 1-way quantum finite automata, quant-ph/9903014.

[BV 93] Ethan Bernstein, Umesh Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory. *Proceedings of STOC'93*, pp.1-10.

[BV 97] Ethan Bernstein, Umesh Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory. *SIAM Journal on Computing,* 26:1411-1473, 1997.

[De 89] David Deutsch. Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer. *Proc. Royal Society London, A400*, 1989. p. 96–117.

[Fe 82] Richard Feynman. Simulating physics with computers. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics,* 1982, vol. 21, No. 6/7, p. 467-488.

[Fr 79] Rūsiņš Freivalds. Fast probabilistic algorithms. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science,* 1979, vol. 74, p. 57–69.

[Ki 98] Arnolds Ķikusts. A small 1-way quantum finite automaton, quant-ph/9810065.

[KW 97] Attila Kondacs and John Watrous. On the power of quantum finite state automata. In *Proc. 38th FOCS*, 1997, p. 66–75.

[MC 97] Christopher Moore, James P. Crutchfield. Quantum automata and quantum grammars. *Theoretical Computer Science*, to appear. Also available at quant-ph/9707031.

[Sh 97] Peter Shor. Polynomial time quantum algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1997, vol. 26, p. 1484-1509.

[Ya 93] Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. Quantum circuit complexity. In *Proc. 34th FOCS*, 1993, p. 352–361.